

FINAL MINUTES
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
April 1-2, 2004
Victorian Inn – Weaverville, CA

Thursday April 1, 2004

The meeting was open to the public.

1:18 Convene

Members in attendance:

Member	Representative Seat
Arnold Whitridge (Chair)	Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment
William Huber	South Fork Trinity River CRMP
James Feider	City of Redding Electric Utility Dept.
Edgar Duggan	Willow Creek Community Services Dist.
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Services
Patrick Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation Dist.
Kevin Lewis	American Whitewater
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Serge Birk	Central Valley Project Water Association
Byron Leydecker	California Trout, Inc.
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter & Guide Association
Tim Colvin	Trinity Lake Resort Owners Association

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL

Mike Long

Field Supervisor of the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, standing in for MaryEllen Mueller

Members not in attendance:

Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Jill Geist, Humboldt County Supervisor; Elizabeth Soderstrom, Natural Heritage Institute; Jeffery Bryant, American Forest Resource Council; Dan Haycox, Miners Alliance.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Chairman Arnold Whitridge opened the meeting and members introduced themselves. Whitridge proposed one change to the agenda. Discussion of TAMWG Charter Renewal and member appointments, Item 11 will be postponed until the next meeting. The December minutes were reviewed. Rich Lorenz made one editorial correction to the minutes.

A motion was made by Rich Lorenz to accept the minutes as amended.

The motion was seconded Byron Leydecker.

The motion was passed.

2. Elect Chair and Vice-Chair for 2004

The first meeting of each calendar year is an annual election for Chair and Vice-Chair.

Rich Lorenz nominated Arnold Whitridge for Chairman.

The nomination was seconded by Byron Leydecker.

The vote was unanimous for Arnold to be re-elected.

Byron Leydecker nominated Serge Birk for Vice-Chair.

The motion was seconded by Dana Hord.

The vote was unanimous for Serge Birk to be re-elected.

3. Public Comment Period

There were no comments from the public.

4. AEAM Program Conception- Clair B. Stalnaker

Dr. Clair Stalnaker, a retired Sr. Scientist Emeritus USGS, and one of the principal authors of the Trinity River Flow Evaluation presented an outline of the “vision” upon which development of the Flow Evaluation and Restoration Program was based (see **Attachment # 1**). He discussed the goals and objectives of the restoration program and reviewed flow and restoration strategies envisioned by the authors of the study.

Dr. Stalnaker explained both the general hypotheses and the restoration goal. The general hypotheses are that channel rehabilitation, temperature control, and timed releases are necessary to achieve the restoration. The restoration goal is, at a minimum, a doubling of the pre-smolt production. Flow regimens for 5 different water year types were prescribed. An environmental assessment program was established to assess data and allow managers to adjust flow regimes within water year type through adaptive management.

Dr. Stalnaker explained the organizational structure of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and identified Mr. Doug Schleusner as the Executive Director of the Program and its primary spokesperson. Serving under the Executive Director are groups that assist in the implementation of the restoration components. The Adaptive

Environmental Assessment and Management TEAM (AEAM) were established to provide technical support to the TMC in relation to design, scientific assessment, and implementation of restoration activities. The Technical Modeling & Analysis Group (TMAG) was established to lead the scientific component of the program and the Rehabilitation Implementation Group (RIG), was established to develop and implement on the ground restoration activities. The Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) was formed to represent stakeholder interests in relation to restoring the Trinity River fishery resources and provide management recommendations to the TMC. As part of a Scientific Advisory Board, peer review committees exist to provide expertise on program elements and include agency representatives with particular expertise, Native American Tribes, and outside experts, with 3 year appointments. These entities are critical to the program and should be functioning as soon as possible.

Dr. Stalnaker said the architects of the TRRP intended to unshackle the river and allow the natural river processes create fish habitat. Models employed in evaluating data are based on scientific results, but the river will build the habitat. In the overall plan, spawning habitat was not the limiting factor, but rather, fry rearing habitat is limiting.

Birk asked about gravel injection, placement, and if it will be used to create spawning habitat and rearing habitat or primarily rearing habitat. Stalnaker reiterated that rearing habitat is the limiting factor and gravel injection will enhance the carving out of the channel. Another question was raised on the estimates regarding temperature and channel flows. It was further explained that the baseline reference has not been established yet and it would be desirable to have all program elements functioning initially at the outset of the TRRP in order to evaluate progress accurately. All the varying factors can be accomplished, but only if all elements of the TRRP operate effectively together.

This year, the TRRP is focused on getting the four bridges replaced. Tom Stokely stated that the bridges are still not completed; more work was required than had been anticipated. The program now is in a position to proceed. Schleusner said bids on the last two bridges are due soon.

Schleusner noted the progress of all program elements, current schedules, and noted that some parts of the program have yet to be implemented. Schleusner touched on the current schedules and where we are right now. By 2008, half the channel modification sites should be implemented. Another meeting in May will be held to discuss these issues further. Birk suggested that TAMWG be given a place on the agenda for the June TMC meeting.

Arnold called for a break from 3:18 to 3:30

5. 2004 Flow Schedule-Daryl Peterson

Daryl Peterson, TMAG leader, presented the Recommended Instream Release Schedule for 2004, which was based on a preliminary water year classification as a “wet water year” (see **Attachment # 2**).

A joint meeting was held March 11, 2004 with TMC and TAMWG representatives to go over this year’s priorities and recommendations, and also to work on a daily flow release schedule. The draft from this meeting was mailed to all the members. The final report should be completed sometime this month April 2004.

Ed Solbos, RIG leader, explained the various time frames available to work on the bridges effectively. Any lost construction days will be added to the end of the contract. Letters have gone to the contractors with this option. The original construction period was May 15, 2004 to September 15, 2004 so as not to endanger spawning fish. The contract will now be extended two months if permits and the B.O. will allow. Solbos stated the final flow schedules will be available mid-April.

Birk requested further explanation on scheduling of construction of the four bridges and possible flow schedule changes in regard to construction.

Whitridge wanted to know if the specifications have been accepted by all departments, for the paperwork to get completed. He also asked about special conditions needed for coho since the species is listed. Peterson said they were trying to be sensitive to fish survival rates. Birk stated that an amendment to the original schedule may be necessary to provide for flexibility if needed.

A motion was made by Rich Lorenz for TAMWG to recommend for TMC to take into account construction constraints and modify flow schedules as needed.

The motion was seconded by Ed Duggan.

The motion did not carry.

Lorenz wanted to know who makes the final decision. Peterson said TMC does.

Birk felt we should have alternative plans, with the option to schedule what we think is best to complete bridge construction. Solbos noted everything is negotiable with the contractors. Birk stated we have the authority to make recommendations to the TMC according to our charter, so he wanted to modify the motion. Some of the members volunteered to work on the motion this evening and bring a modified version to the meeting in the morning.

5:18 Adjourned for the day, we will resume at 8:30 am tomorrow.

Friday, April 2, 8:44 am

Whitridge noted we had a quorum and proceeded to open the meeting.

There was a motion on the table yesterday when we adjourned, after some discussion the motion was voted on.

A motion was made by William Huber that we accept the revised version.

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The revised motion reads as follows:

TAMWG recommends to the TMC that in adopting this year's Trinity River flow schedule it also should be sensitive to the possible need for changes in it to accommodate completion of bridge construction this year as specified in the contract for construction. If changes are required, it also must recognize the needs of the fishery. In the event construction is delayed, we ask that the TMC take action to extend permitting time(s) as appropriate.

6. Program Evaluation Report-Curtis Anderson

Curtis Anderson, Trinity Management Council Subcommittee Chairman made a presentation on the Trinity River Restoration Program Evaluation Final Report (see **Attachment # 3**). Anderson gave a short update of the TMC meeting in December, 2003. He outlined some of the goals established in the Record of Decision (ROD) and progress made toward achieving them in the past two years. Over the past five months, there have been a number of meetings of the TMC Subcommittee to prepare the Program Evaluation Final Report (Report).

Anderson stated that program participants (TMC, TAMWG, TRRP staff) need 'a more common vision and understanding' of the TRPP. A joint meeting between the TAMWG and the TMC in May has been proposed. The Report indicates that the TMC needs to be more engaged, there should be more frequent meetings including monthly conference calls, and there are staff vacancies that need to be filled. The TMAG is critically important to the TRRP's success and needs to be fully staffed.

Feider asked about the current layout of TMAG, because it was unclear. Currently TMAG consists of Peterson as the group leader and Andreas Kraus is the Physical Scientist. Pat Frost asked about other vacant positions, such as the GIS position. Anderson stated that some of the job descriptions were complex and the difficulty in finding persons that meet required qualifications. He suggested pay grades should be raised. Birk requested clarification on which positions are unfilled. Peterson described the positions in more detail, including those that were filled and those that still needed to be filled. (GIS and Fishery Biologist positions)

Duggan proposed that because of the hiring problems, perhaps some persons serving on subcommittees could help review. The possibility of job sharing was posed. Depending upon the requirements of the position, Anderson said this could be employed and might be appropriate depending upon where the people are located. Anderson suggested that reviewing plans in the future to keep them more focused on overall objectives would be helpful.

The Report describes the necessary changes to move the subcommittee's recommendations forward. The subcommittee would like TAMWG to provide input for the May meeting regarding topics to be discussed and what decisions TAMWG members would like to see result from this meeting. TAMWG members could provide comment on the recommended technical sub-committee structure, etc.

Leydecker asked to go back to a slide in the presentation. He felt if we focused on recommendations and brought the major thrust to the May meeting with TMC; it would provide focus for the meeting. Not all persons and groups involved in the TRRP are familiar with the overall vision and concept of the program, and we all need to have a common understanding of it. Feider had a question on recommendations regarding the recruitment process and policy. Anderson reviewed the realities of the work required and how to get where we want to be.

Leydecker noted the issue was the extent to which each entity is fulfilling its role and the adverse impact of the delay in creating some sub-groups, particularly the Scientific Advisory Board and its sub-committees. Schleusner responded by describing Bureau policies, skills needed, and the integration of Bureau policies with the Implementation Plan. Birk wanted to clarify the role of the TMC and the Bureau of Reclamation. He posed the question of who has overall responsibility for the TRRP, the Bureau or the TMC. Schleusner further explained the flexibility in filling these positions. All positions have been advertised inside and outside. Birk felt TAMWG should consider making a recommendation to TMC to get more involved in order to provide solutions to hiring problems. Schleusner agreed a recommendation from TAMWG would carry a lot of weight.

Frost brought up the issue of budget recommendations and asked whether this was contributing to the staffing problem. He asked if anyone looked at the staffing problem. Leydecker asked to go back to the roles and responsibilities slide in Anderson's presentation. The issue, he said was whether the TRRP would be operated under the Bureau's standard operating procedures, or the TRRP should be implemented as envisioned.

Birk felt the summary on page 32 was good. He said we clearly need to show more passion to achieve these program elements. The Subcommittee has done the homework, now we need to follow through. Leydecker pointed out again that it's been over three years since the Record of Decision, and the program is beyond the bounds of the Bureau's SOP.

Schleusner felt this was a good time to comment on this area. This report doesn't really point to where we are today, in the context the Record of Decision that was signed in December of 2000. Schleusner noted that his office was not established until October 2002, and that's the baseline he feels we should be using. From that stand point, we have made progress and are on schedule. The litigation has had a major affect on the TRRP and has had a huge impact on the ability of some key factors of the program to be fully implemented. He knows first hand that many people have been involved that have not been able to implement this plan as hoped.

Birk agreed with that statement, and also stated the program could be a little more progressive now. Good research has been accomplished, but we need to reevaluate our goals and whether they are still realistic. Leydecker agreed. Duggan applauded all of Anderson's and the subcommittee's work and felt Anderson had provided invaluable input in which to evaluate the TRRP and move forward.

Whitridge asked if there were any recommendations or responses on how to proceed.

Spear had questions on channel modification projects and the idea of allowing the river to do the work. Franklin stated that the TRRP was misunderstood and it's going to take time for the river to do its work after the river channel is unshackled, but the river is going to change to the point that it will be unrecognizable. Spear asked if we think there is going to be an agreement at the May 12, 2004 meeting. Franklin agreed that the joint meeting should help provide the basis for a more effective program.

Whitridge felt that different approaches to constructing rehabilitation sites might be useful. Spear thinks this group needs to consolidate on the common vision and present our position in a unified front. The TMC needs to play a very active role, because, given the circumstances that we have today, the TRRP will be implementing that first set of channel modification projects by 2008, any sooner than that is going to require some other radical changes in attitude and policy.

Peterson said the focus has been on the bridges instead of the channel modification projects, but explained that staff was working on engineering designs. The TRRP intended that projects move ahead and we are behind schedule. TAMWG members generally agreed with that assessment.

Leydecker stated that the lack of understanding was partially due to the fact that the Scientific Advisory Board was not functioning yet. The most pressing issue seems to be a question of whether the river would be unshackled as the TRRP intended or would the focus be the mechanical creation of habitat. Leydecker felt we need the scientific elements of the program functioning. Peterson agreed with that statement and explained how the differences come into play regarding the sites.

Whitridge thinks TAMWG should concentrate on responses and recommendations to the TMC about the Report. Duggan asked 'why can't we combine or incorporate the

reports? Peterson explained that science is different from design. They are two separate subjects.

Lorenz felt the staff is looking for stakeholder support, so TAMWG should develop their common vision and present it to the TMC.

A motion was made by Byron Leydecker that ‘TAMWG endorse the Executive Summary in this report and that we engage in through and wide range discussions with TMC about the nature of this report.’

The motion was seconded by Birk

The motion did not carry.

Whitridge wanted to take a moment to review the motion. He noted the need in getting the TMC to focus on their role and the importance of their support prior to entering into wide ranging discussions. Duggan asked Anderson if this report had been presented to the TMC. Anderson replied that it had not, but it had been emailed and will be presented at the May meeting. Leydecker noted that timing of release of the report was important for the education process.

Birk brought us back to the Executive Summary. Feider said it sounded to him that we support the general theme of the report. Another member suggested that what we really want to do is request that TMC be prepared to take this report, engage with TAMWG members on it, and run with it. The TMC needs to be ready to decide it wants to proceed.

Whitridge asked Leydecker if that still embodies his motion. Byron said yes, that expresses it much more eloquently, and the essence is still there. Schleusner requests that this group also come to the May 12, 2004 joint meeting with specific thoughts and recommendations pertaining to this report. As the director, he would appreciate some guidance on priorities.

Whitridge said we should dispose of the motion on the floor before we go any further.

After some discussion this is the motion agreed upon:

TAMWG endorses the theme of the Executive Summary and requests that TMC be prepared to act and respond at the May 12, 2004 joint meeting.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Anderson suggested that it might be helpful to visit channel modification sites as a group. It was deemed unrealistic at this point to try to organize a trip like that right now. Duggan asked if there would be any objections to individuals going out and taking a look by themselves? There didn't seem to be any strong objections. Peterson said the staff would try to assist members in site reviews in any reasonable manner that it could.

7. Strategic Plan-Doug Schleusner

Schleusner went over the tools to be used on May 12, 2004 the purpose of the plan, the long term program mission statement, the 2004-09 set of objectives, key strategies, and the goal of the program(see **attachment # 4**).

The plan focuses on the goal, the objectives and implementing the Record of Decision. He also went over the key concepts authors tried to build into the plan (see **Attachment # 4a.**). They have been wrestling the most with the long term mission statement. Referring to page 2, he read the brief comment expressing the need for a short term mission statement.

Whitridge asked if there were any questions or suggestions. Birk wanted clarification on revisiting the plan in five years. Schleusner said it will be revisited and reviewed and possibly revised. He further explained that the Record of Decision requests that after each site phase is implemented it is reviewed and evaluated to determine how to proceed with the remainder of the plan.

Birk said that the short term and long term impacts on all wildlife and plant communities had to be taken into consideration. Schleusner said all those issues are addressed in more detail in the document. Birk also stated that those issues should be highlighted in the short term goals. Program elements also need to be done in concert with each other to try and satisfy all factors of concern.

Leydecker felt we should all be on the same page. Schleusner said that is why he would like to have written suggestions from TAMWG and TMC to get everyone on the same page.

12:00 Lunch

Meeting was resumed at 1:20 pm

8. Interior Perspective on Litigation Settlement-Mike Ryan

Mike Ryan, Trinity Management Council Chairman, made a presentation on the proposed settlement advanced by Bennett Raley in the Westlands litigation. The proposed settlement included 20,000 acre feet of water as a ready reserve and an emergency reserve of 50,000 acre feet.

Adaptive management would allow the flow to be increased or decreased as needed. There was a question regarding where the funding for water purchases would come from? That question has not been answered yet.

The chances of having a normal water-type year are one in five. Leydecker asked about a possible linkage to a guaranteed supply to Westlands? Mike said no. This alternative could come into play with the Endangered Species Act requirements. Ryan also said no Preferred Alternative in the supplemental EIS has yet been determined.

Birk had a question on the reserve water for Trinity, what is the vision behind that? Ryan's understanding is that those two reserves would be held for Trinity on an as needed basis regardless of the year type. Birk further asked that if that meant the TRRP would have 70,000 acre feet in reserve at any time? Mike said yes that's the way he understood it (see **Attachment # 5**).

Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe, asked if they were ready to provide this water. And the answer was yes. Ryan thinks we are going to see litigation regardless of what is contained in the Record of Decision. He's not concerned about being sued as much as losing if there is litigation. Assistant Secretary Raley felt comfortable releasing the SEIS within the month.

On March 11, 2004 the Hoopa Valley Tribe wrote that the SEIS was not going to be adequate to meet environmental documentation requirements and fishery needs, and asked that Interior withdraw. He's not sure if they still feel that way or not.

Ryan yielded the floor to Franklin. Whitridge had questions about changing the ROD now. He was curious as to the willingness of the Interior to modify or abandon or sacrifice the existing ROD provisions. What is Interior's broader thinking about the fundamental importance or significance of the ROD or what is its commitment to the ROD? Those are the kinds of reasons he put this subject on the agenda.

Franklin has been involved in every meeting and phone conversation regarding this subject. The tribal counsel wanted the Secretary to let them know what she was offering for discussion by way of a potential proposal. But, the chance is zero that there will be a reply. There has already been an agreement based on the science, that's not the problem. The Tribe saw the proposal for the first time when they met with Raley on February 9, 2004. It was portrayed by Raley as something that he hoped could be a catalyst for something suitable if it weren't suitable. What the Tribe saw was a proposal that started out with water volume levels less than science had already said was required, and that you would have to buy water for the Trinity River. Essentially it was saying "let's give the water to someone else and then buy it back." The Tribe disagrees with this approach. The Tribe is still willing to work with Interior to try and figure out a way to the goal of restoring fish in the Trinity River. The Tribe has worked cooperatively with the trustee for twenty-plus years. The scientists from the Interior have their finger prints all over and their signatures on the bottom line of the Trinity River ROD, as do many other departments and agencies.

It was agreed that the proposal would not be publicized because of the critical flaws. However, it was publicized and this portrayed the Tribe as being very uncooperative. This was not the case.

Whitridge wanted to clarify his earlier statement about the possible changes. He feels it's significant that requiring a higher 'burden of proof' that did not exist before under the ROD is a potential, and this was scheduled as an informational item. He would like to understand Interior's thinking on the subject. He wasn't able to declare it completely wrong, but it appears to be different from the ROD which he thought had already been committed to by Interior.

Whitridge didn't think there were any constructive things we could do about it now. We will have to wait for further developments. Whitridge strongly feels that if the Secretary's personal representative is willing to abandon the ROD, he considers that very relevant.

Lorenz said he appreciates the Assistant Secretary of the Interior's efforts, at least he is trying to do something, and he thinks there's something to be said for that. Whitridge thinks it was helpful and he thanked Ryan for coming.

9. Executive Director's Report-Doug Schleusner

Doug Schleusner, Trinity River Restoration Program, handed out the first quarter report from December through April 2004 (see **Attachment # 6**). From what they are hearing and seeing he feels the program is developing momentum, for a number of reasons. Number one is relationships; the things that have been said and done in groups like this one are examples of growing relationships at the technical level. He thinks that is positive. He's also seeing improved relationships with local land owners, through the bridges project, for example, and the newly formed Salt Flat Owner's Association.

Last Saturday, staff met with the Poker Bar Property Owner's Association. Association members voted 84 to 1 in favor of supporting the Poker Bar Bridge and associated roads. This was a very positive and supportive kind of meeting. All of these relationships are giving momentum to the program.

From the funding standpoint, the latest proposal the county submitted to the Coastal Salmon Recovery Program was approved for just less than 1.2 million. So, at this point, the State has contributed over the last two years 2.3 million dollars as part of the bridges projects. We will be seeing construction on those bridges in a very short time. And when that starts happening people will begin to start realizing that this program is not just studies and reports, etc., it's going to be tangible, visible, evidence that progress is being made.

The SEIS will be published shortly and again once more we will be reading about it in the local papers. There are a lot of things happening. One very important event 'Lower Klamath Trinity Science Work Shop' on June 7-10, 2004 will be held in the Arcata or

Eureka area. Schleusner and Mike Long, Dave Hillemeir and others are on the steering committee. They will be discussing the NRC report and many other things. The June TMC meeting still has not been scheduled as yet.

Schleusner briefly went over the 'Channel Restoration Sites Progress Report', the Terms & Conditions, etc. He suggested everyone spend a little time looking over that information. Most of these topics will be talked about on May 12, 2004. Spear brought up another legal issue regarding Canyon Creek and the river below that point.

Whitridge asked if there were anymore questions or comments. There were none.

10. SEIS Report-Lead Agency Representative

Tom Stokely, senior planner with Trinity County, gave an update on the SEIS. He wanted everyone to know that Mike Ryan did a really good job of supporting the ROD and the science behind it. The supplemental EIS will probably be out in the next couple of weeks. The schedule is to try and get something out by November or at least by the end of the calendar year.

Trinity Co. is concerned about not having the biological assessment completed. It would be problematic to send out the draft document when we didn't know what the RPM's were going to be. Subsequently, the Biological Assessment has been completed and submitted to Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries.

Several elements of the SEIS are interdependent and that's what is slowing down the completion of the SEIS report. The draft SEIS report is being released to the public before a completed biological opinion on OCAP, so there is risk involved. There will be a 60 day public comment and review period once the document is made available. The lead agencies will respond to all comments. Then, a final SEIS report will be released. Sometime after that there will be a supplemental Record of Decision.

Trinity County is hoping that there will be a resolution to the litigation in a compromise agreement and the litigation will be ended. The chances of that becoming a reality are pretty slim. Secondly, Judge Wanger's decision has been appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals by the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Yurok Tribe. So, there is a pending appeal and they are hoping to have Judge Wanger's decision overturned. The other option, which is the most likely development, is that the SEIS will go out and there will be continued litigation, or it will be turned over to another Judge and we will be able to continue with the ROD or a revision of the same. At this point, the preferred alternative is contained in ROD that was signed by former Secretary Bruce Babbitt and the Hoopa Valley Tribe in December 2000.

There's always the possibility that there will be some legislative action taken to basically say that the ROD can be implemented. Along those lines there is some state legislation pending right now that's related to this by Senator Mike Machado, Chairman of the State Senate Agriculture & Water Committee, Bill # SB1155. The bill in its present form would prohibit the use of state facilities, like the pumps in the southern Delta, and some

state storage and transmission facilities, to allow increased water exports south of the Delta until certain requirements or guarantees have been met such as water quality standards. At the Water Education Foundation executive briefing a few weeks ago, Senator Machado gave the key note speech and he must have mentioned the Trinity River at least a half dozen times. Tom understands that he is considering adding some amendments that would essentially prohibit the use of state facilities to increase water exports south of the Delta until there are guarantees that the Trinity River ROD is implemented.

Obviously, the state has no say over federal operations, or is reluctant to express their say. This law would not force the Federal government to do anything, but, essentially it would put a hold on the Napa Proposal and the plans to increase water exports from the San Francisco Bay-Delta until the Trinity River is guaranteed that it will have some of its water returned to it.

Napa and related issues are mired in a lot of politics, so time will tell what the outcome will be.

11. TAMWG Charter Renewal & Member Appointments-Designated Fed. Official

Whitridge proposed to postpone this discussion until the next meeting, but he wanted everyone to know that both the Federal Charter and their own appointments as members expire in October.

12. Report from Watersheds Subcommittee

The Watershed Sub-committee members, Jim Spear and Pat Frost, reported there have been some positive developments relative to the watershed issue between the staff and the Forest Service. Frost discussed the contract for watershed rehabilitation. The first contract will be for the Rush Creek watershed and the possible fixes regarding sediment issues, etc. between the multiple agencies. Agency representatives met last February, and the RCD has taken ownership as much as possible, and it is trying to determine GIS data needed.

Whitridge asked if the Sub-committee had any idea when planning would end and implementation would start. The Forest Service side is intended to begin this summer. On the bigger scale it's at least a year away.

The extent to which the program can deal with the sediment issues depends upon the willingness of landowners. Attempts to control sediment will be a good opportunity to work closely with the landowners. In the bigger watershed context, Schleusner and Spear attended a January meeting of all the conservation districts in the Klamath/Trinity watershed being led by the NRCS. They are going to meet again in late April to discuss conservation practices throughout the watershed and they will try to re-emphasize that the Trinity is a key part of the overall watershed.

The Subcommittee also has been meeting with California Department of Fish and Game as a prelude to its next grant cycle which is usually in May. Part of the watershed coordination role was to try to find funds for doing restoration on private land. Meetings have been held with some of Fish and Game's staff to talk about high priority projects.

RCD just finished an inventory of all the roads on BLM land and is going through the final analysis right now. Schleusner did want to let the group know that in Grass Valley Creek this year we did not get funding from California Department of Fish and Game to continue the up-slope work. He said that is unfortunate because next year will be the tenth and final year of that re-vegetation plan. Money to grow the trees is available and they are being grown, about \$200K, and funding is available to write the final report from BLM, but there's no the funding to hire the crew and plant the trees in the ground next fall and next spring. He said there may be a big tree give away. Staff has to find a way to get this accomplished very soon.

Whitridge asked if Schleusner had met the replacement for Chuck Schultz yet. He said no, he hadn't arrived yet. He should be here around April 19, 2004 and then he will go away for a couple of weeks of training. Schleusner thought it would be desirable for someone to send him an invitation to attend the TAMWG meetings. Whitridge agreed. He also thanked the Watershed Subcommittee members for their activities and he thinks this is one in which TAMWG is taking noticeable leadership and physically contributing not just with policy, but with getting the work done.

13. Public Comment Period

Sid M. (Public Participant) voiced concern in regard to expediting the bridge permits in advance so the job will not be held up.

14. Assignments and Calendars

The next meeting was tentatively set for Monday June 14, 2004.

Whitridge reminded everyone they have homework and they need to attend the May meeting with constructive and specific ideas.

5:00 Meeting Adjourned

Summary of all Motions Passed

- 1. December Minutes: Approval of minutes from December 2003 meeting
A motion was made by Rich Lorenz to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Byron Leydecker. The motion was passed**
- 2. Elect Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2004**

Rich Lorenz nominated Arnold Whitridge for Chairman. The motion was seconded by Byron Leydecker. The vote was unanimous for Arnold to be re-elected. Byron Leydecker nominated Serge Birk for Vice-Chair. The motion was seconded by Dana Hord. The vote was unanimous for Serge to be re-elected.

3. 2004 Flow Schedule A motion was made by William Huber to accept the revised motion

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The revised motion reads as follows:

TAMWG recommends to the TMC that in adopting this year's Trinity River flow schedule it also should be sensitive to the possible need for changes in it to accommodate completion of bridge construction this year as specified in the contract for construction. If changes are required, it also must recognize the needs of the fishery. In the event construction is delayed, we ask that the TMC take action to extend permitting time(s) as appropriate.

4. Program Evaluation Report – A motion was made by Byron Leydecker that TAMWG endorses the theme of the Executive Summary and requests that TMC be prepared to act and respond at the May 12, 2004 joint meeting.

The motion was seconded by Birk

The motion passed unanimously.

List of Attachments

This lists the person (source) and the materials that were handed out during the meeting.

1. Clair Stalnaker: AEAM Program Conception presentation handout.
2. Darrel Peterson: 2004 Flow Schedule
3. Curtis Anderson: Program Evaluation Report
4. Doug Schleusner: 2004 Strategic Plan
- 4a Reviewer's Guide
5. Mile Ryan: Interior Perspective on Litigation Settlement
6. Doug Schleusner: Executive Director's Report